

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05387 01 OF 03 031351Z

45

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

USIE-00 EB-07 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NRC-05 ERDE-00 /095 W

----- 111451

O P 031300Z OCT 75

FM UMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3849

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 5387

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING OCTOBER 2

REFS: A. USNATO 5118 DTG 191415Z SEP 75

B. USNATO 4857 DTG 081500 Z SEP 75

C. USNATO 5306 DTG 301500Z SEP 75

D. USNATO 5251 DTG 251759Z SEP 75

SUMMARY: AT OCTOBER 2 SPC MEETING, UK REP EXPLAINED THE NEW UK POSITION ON " APPROPRIATE DEFINITION" OF THE COMMON CEILING. UK WOULD USE THE US PHRASE IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT ONLY IN INITIAL PRESENTATIONS. UK ASSUMES THAT AS PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS PROGRESS, ALLIES WILL BE ABLE TO SETTLE ON A SPECIFIC NUMBER FOR THE COMMON CEILING. THUS ALLIES WOULD LATER IN PHASE I MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT THE EAST MUST AGREE BOTH ON A SPECIFIC NUMBER FOR THE COMMON CEILING AND ON THE POST PHASE I DATA IN THE PHASE I AGREEMENT. (THUS THE NEW UK SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05387 01 OF 03 031351Z

POSITION ACTUALLY ADDS TO THE PHASE I REQUIREMENTS IN THE PREVIOUS UK POSITION, (SINCE UK PREVIOUSLY ONLY SOUGHT A SPECIFIC NUMBER FOR THE COMMON CEILING.) ANOTHER ITEM OF INTEREST WAS ITALIAN PROPOSAL TO DELETE BOTH OF THE ALTERNATIVE REFERENCES TO

MANPOWER LIMITATIONS IN PARA 10 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. THIS PROPOSAL AND THE DISCUSSION WHICH FOLLOWED SERVED TO EMPHASIZE THE ISOLATION OF BELGIUM IN WISHING LANGUAGE TO THE EFFECT THAT MANPOWER LIMITATIONS CONSTRAIN EQUIPMENT. ACTION REQUESTED: SEE PARA 16 BELOW. END SUMMARY.

1. UK REP (BAILES) SAID UK DELEGATION HAD NOW RECEIVED FURTHER EXPLANATION FROM LONDON OF THE UK POSITION REPRESENTED BY UK ACCEPTANCE AT THE LAST MEETING OF THE US PHRASE ON APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF THE COMMON CEILING IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE (FIRST BRACKETED PHRASE IN SECOND TIC OF TEXT IN REF A). UK HAD ACCEPTED THAT THE COMMON CEILING "MIGHT" BE SET AT "APPROXIMATELY" 900,000 MEN BECAUSE IN INITIAL ALLIED PRESENTATION TO THE EAST IT WILL BE IMPOSSIBLE TO STATE A SPECIFIC FIGURE, IN VIEW OF LACK OF AGREEMENT ON DATA AND DEFINITIONS. UK POSITION WOULD BE CLEARER LATER IN THE MEETING, WHEN SPC CONSIDERED THE DRAFT POSITION PAPER.

2. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID THAT THE UK REP HAD CITED A REASON FOR USE OF THE WORD "APPROXIMATELY" BUT NOT FOR USE OF THE WORD "MIGHT". UK REP REPLIED THAT "APPROXIMATELY" WOULD COVER A SMALL AREA OF CHANGE, E.G. A VARIATION OF THE SPECIFIC NUMBER FOR THE COMMON CEILING OF PERHAPS 10,000, BUT WOULD NOT COVER A POSSIBLE VARIATION DUE TO CHANGES IN DATA AND DEFINITIONS OF SAY 50,000. UK WANTED TO LEAVE ALL AVENUES OPEN.

3. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES HAD NOTICED THAT PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE MIGHT LEAD THE OTHER SIDE TO THINK THAT THE ALLIES, IN PROPOSING INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING, WERE PROPOSING AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS. HE THOUGHT AHG SHOULD BE ABLE TO MAKE IT CLEAR THIS IS NOT THE CASE. (COMMENT: HOYNCK TOLD US AFTER THE MEETING THAT BONN WILL WANT LANGUAGE IN THE GUIDANCE, POSITION PAPER OR TACTICS PAPER, IF THERE IS ONE, TO ENABLE AHG TO MAKE CLEAR THE ALLIES ARE NOT PROPOSING AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS. WASHINGTON MAY THEREFORE WISH TO START CONSIDERING AN APPROPRIATE SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05387 01 OF 03 031351Z

SENTENCE ON THIS SUBJECT.)

4. UK REP LATER IN THE MEETING EXPLAINED UK POSITION ON THE COMMON CEILING IN TERMS OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT POSITION PAPER (REF B), WITH FINAL TIC AS AMENDED BY PARA 3, REF C. UK MAKES A DISTINCTION BETWEEN WHAT AHG SAYS TO THE OTHER SIDE IN INITIAL PRESENTATION OF OPTION III, AND WHAT THE ALLIES MUST INSIST ON AS THE CONTEXT OF A PHASE I AGREEMENT. THUS THE US SENTENCE IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE IS SUITABLE FOR USE WITH THE OTHER SIDE IN INITIAL PRESENTATIONS. HOWEVER, UK ASSUMES THAT AS PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS PROGRESS, AND AFTER DISCUSSIONS WITH THE EAST ON DATA AND DEFINITIONS, MUCH OF THE UNCERTAINTY ABOUT THE MOST DESIRABLE LEVEL OF THE

COMMON CEILING WILL HAVE GONE.

5. UK REP SAID THAT UK THEREFORE WISHED TO WORK WITH THE FRG VERSION OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT POSITION PAPER, I.E, THE SECOND " OR" VERSION. UK ACCEPTED THE CHAPEAU TO THIS VERSION OF PARA 3, WITH THE INDICATION OF INCULSION OF AIR MANPOWER, AND THE REFERENCE TO A GROUND/AIR CEILING OF 900,000 MEN. UK ALSO AGREES TO THE LEAD IN TO THE TICS, AND TO THE FIRST TIC. HOWEVER, THE FIRST PART OF THE SECOND TIC IS UNNECESSARY, IN VIEW OF THE FIRST TIC; THE SECOND PART OF THE SECOND TIC RE THE COLLECITVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS REPRESENTS A SEPARATE ISSUE, NOT YET DISCUSSED BY THE ALLIES, AND SHOULD BE DELETED. UK BELIEVES THAT THE THIRD TIC (SEE PARA 3 REF C FOR LATEST VERSION) SHOULD BE REVISED SO THAT WHAT IS NOW STATED AS TWO ALTER-NATIVES BECOME TWO REQUIREMENTS, AS FOLLOWS: (NOTE: PAREN- THESES INDICATED SQUARE BRACKETS) " UNDERSTANDING WITH THE EAST AS TO THE LEVEL (S) OF GROUND (AND AIR) FORCE PERSONNEL OF BOTH SIDES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS FOLLOWING PHASE I REDUCTIONS, AND AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST ON THE FIGURE FOR THE COMMON COLLECITVE CEILING, SAY (700,000)(900,000) MEN ON EACH SIDE." SHE NOTED THAT THE UK, IN ADDITION TO CONVERTING THE TWO FRG ALTERNATIVES INTO TWO REQUIREMENTS, ALSO DROPPED THE WORD "ILLUSTRATIVE" SINCE THE ALLIES SHOULD BE ABLE TO SET MORE THAN AN ILLUSTRATVIE FIGURE BY THE TIME THEY GET TO THE PAHSE I AGREEMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 05387 02 OF 03 031432Z

45

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

USIE-00 EB-07 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NRC-05 ERDE-00 /095 W

----- 112014

O P 031300Z OCT 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3850

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 5387

6. NETHERLANDS REP QUESTIONED WHY UK WOULD NOT WANT TO EXPLAIN THAT POSITION IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, RATHER THAN ACCEPTING THE US SENTENCE THERE. UK REP SAID THIS POSITION WAS BEST REGISTERED IN THE POSITION PAPER, TO BE USED WITH THE OTHER SIDE LATER IN LIGHT OF DEGREE OF UNDERSTANDING WHICH DEVELOPS ON DATA AND DEFINITIONS.

7. DANISH REP (VILLADSEN) QUESTIONED THE NEED FOR AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST ON DATA ON RESIDUAL LEVELS AFTER PHASE I, AS CONTAINED IN BOTH FRG, AND NOW THE UK VERSIONS. FRG REP SAID THIS WOULD ESTABLISH THE NATURE OF THE ASYMMETRY AND HELP SET THE FRAMEWORK FOR PHASE II REDUCTIONS. HE ALSO REITERATED FRG DESIRE THAT THE ALLIES OBTAIN EASTERN AGREEMENT ON THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS AS PART OF "APPROPRIATE DEFINITION" OF THE COMMON CEILING IN OPTION III.

8. US REP SAID HE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO REVIEW THE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05387 02 OF 03 031432Z

US POSITION ON THE FRG VERSION OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT POSITION PAPER. HE NOTED THAT THE US AGREED WITH THE UK THAT THE NATURE OF THE REDUCTION COMMITMENTS WAS AN ISSUE SEPARATE FROM OPTION III, AND SHOULD NOT HAVE A PLACE IN THE POSITION PAPER ON OPTION III. HE RECALLED US VIEW THAT PRESENT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG ON THIS SUBJECT WAS ADEQUATE AT LEAST FOR NOW, AND THERE WAS NO OPERATIONAL NEED AT PRESENT FOR NEW GUIDANCE ON THIS ISSUE. HE FURTHER OBSERVED THAT THE US HAD NOT BEEN ABLE TO AGREE TO EITHER PART OF THE FRG THIRD TIC, EVEN WHEN THEY WERE ALTERNATIVES, AS UNDER THE FRG APPROACH. HE SAID THE US BELIEVED IN PRESSING THE EAST ON AN EXCHANGE OF DATA, BUT NATO HAS NOT YET DECIDED ON WHAT DATA THE EAST HAD TO AGREE, IN ORDER THAT THERE BE A REDUCTIONS AGREEMENT. THIS WAS A SEPARATE QUESTION FROM OPTION III. HE NOTED THAT SEEKING EASTERN AGREEMENT IN PHASE I ON THE DATA WHICH WOULD BE USED IN PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS, AND SEEKING EASTERN AGREEMENT IN PHASE I ON A NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING AS THE OUTCOME OF PHASE II WOULD RAISE A NUMBER OF PHASE II ISSUES WITH WHICH THE ALLIES ARE NOT YET PREPARED TO DEAL, AND WOULD GIVE THE EAST AN OPENING TO PRESS FOR AGREEMENT ON ALLOCATION OF ALLIED PHASE II REDUCTIONS. HE SAID THAT THE US CONSIDERED IT SUFFICIENT FOR ALLIED PURPOSES, TO PROVIDE A LIMIT TO ALLIED REDUCTIONS, IF THE ALLIES CITED AN ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURE OF THE COMMON CEILING, WHICH WAS REFLECTED IN THE NEGOTIATING RECORD, AND NOT SPECIFICALLY CHALLENGED BY THE EAST.

9. FRG REP SAID FRG COULD NOT REGARD THE QUESTION OF THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS AS SEPARATE FROM OPTION III. UK REP SAID THAT WHAT UK IS TRYING TO DO WITH OPTION III IS

DOWN A WHOLE RANGE" OF POINTS IN A
CONCLUSIVE WAY.

10A. RE THE FOOTNOTE TO THE FIRST SENTENCE OF PARA 3 OF THE
DRAFT GUIDANCE ("THE QUESTION OF TIMING WILL BE ADDRESSED
LATER BY THE COUNCIL") ITALIAN REP WONDERED WHAT "LATER"
MEANT. FRG REP SUGGESTED INSTEAD THE WORD "SEPARATELY",
AND THIS CHANGE WAS ACCEPTED AD REFERENDUM BY THE SPC.
ITALIAN REP AGAIN ASKED US REP WHEN THE US INTENDED TO
SUBMIT ITSPAPER ON NEGOTIATING STRATEGY. US REP SAID HE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05387 02 OF 03 031432Z

HAD NOTHING NEW ON THE SUBJECT, AND HOPED TO HAVE SOMETHING
SOON. ITALIAN REP SAID IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO KNOW
THE INTENTION OF THE US AUTHORITIES REGARDING THE PAPER
ON NEGOTIATING STRATEGY, A PAPER WHICH ROME BELIEVES
IS NECESSARY. FRG REP SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WANT A PAPER
ON NEGOTIATING STRATEGY. (COMMENT: WE ASKED FRG
REP AFTER THE MEETING IF THIS STATEMENT WERE BASED ON NEW
INSTRUCTIONS. HE SAID IT WAS NOT, BUT THAT HE FELT COMPELLED
TO REITERATE HIS STANDING INSTRUCTIONS IN LIGHT OF
THE ITALIAN STATEMENT.

10B. FRG REP NOTED THAT SPC AT THE LAST MEETING HAD AGREED TO THE
FRG REWRITE OF PARAS 4 AND 5 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE , AS
CONTAINED IN PARA 4, REF D. HOWEVER, HIS AUTHORITIES THOUGHT IT
WOULD BE USEFUL TO INTRODUCE A CERTAIN CLARIFICATION AT THE
END OF THE FIRST SENTENCE OF PARA 5, AS FOLLOWS: "... AND THAT
LIMITATIONS WOULD HAVE TO BE DETERMINED BY THESE REDUCTIONS."
UK REP SAID THIS WOULD SIMPLY REINTRODCE THE PROBLEM THAT
GREATER SPECIFICITY IN THIS PARA WOULD RAISE LIMITATIONS
QUESTION PREMATURELY. US REP SAID THAT, IN VIEW
OF HIS PREVIOUS INSTRUCTIONS ON THIS POINT, HE DID NOT BELIEVE
THE US COULD ACCEPT THIS FRG AMENDMENT. FRG REP SAID THAT
IN VIEW OF THE LACK OF SUPPORT FOR THE FRG AMENDMENT, HE WOULD
WITHDRAW IT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 05387 03 OF 03 031451Z

45
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

USIE-00 EB-07 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NRC-05 ERDE-00 /095 W

----- 112250

O P 031300Z OCT 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3851
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 5387

11. SPC CONFIRMED THE AD REFENDUM AGREEMENT AT THE LAST MEETING TO REPLACE THE BRACKETED PHRASES IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF PARA 6 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE BY " THE BASIC ELEMENTS AS CONTAINED IN PARA 1".

12. ITALIAN REP PROPOSED DELETION OF BOTH OF THE ALTERNATIVE BRACKETED PHRASES IN PARA 10 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE RE LIMITATIONS ON MANPOWER. HE SAID IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO GIVE THE OTHER SIDE, AS A REASON FOR NO LIMITATIONS ON NON US ALLIED EQUIPMENT, THE FACT THAT THERE WOULD BE LIMITATIONS ON MANPOWER. IT IS DANGEROUS TO QUALIFY IN THIS MANNER THE ALLIED REFUSAL TO ACCEPT LIMITATIONS ON NON US ALLIED EQUIPMENT.

13. US REP SAID HE FOUND THE ITALIAN STATEMENT INTERESTING. HE SAID ITALIAN REP HAD CITED THE REASON WHY THE US, THE FRG THE UK AND THE NETHERLANDS HAD MOVED AWAY FROM THE FIRST BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE TO THE SECOND "COMPROMISE" ALTERNATIVE, WHICH DOES NOT QUALIFY ALLIED UNWILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT LIMITATIONS ON
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05387 03 OF 03 031451Z

NON US EQUIPMENT, AND WHICH DOES NOT RECOGNIZE AN ALLIED OBLIGATION TO GIVE THE OTHER SIDE ASSURANCE RE NON US EQUIPMENT. NEITHER DOES THE SECOND ALTERNATIVE MAKE ANY CLAIMS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MANPOWER LIMITATIONS IN CONSTRAINING EQUIPMENT WHICH WOULD GIVE THE EAST AN EASY TARGET. BELGIAN REP (BURNY), WHOSE COUNTRY IS THE ONLY ONE STILL SUPPORTING THE FIRST ALTERNATIVE, SAID HE COULD NOT AGREE WITH THE ITALIAN REP ON DELETION OF ANY REFERENCE TO THE MANPOWER LIMITATIONS.

14. FRG REP SAID HE COULD UNDERSTAND THE ARGUMENT RAISED BY THE ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVE. HE SAID ON A PERSONAL BASIS THAT HE SAW SOME MERIT IN AMENDING THE SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE IN PARA 10, SO THAT IT WOULD BEGIN " AS NECESSARY, THE AHG MIGHT ADD THAT THE ONLY ..." UK REP ON A PERSONAL BASIS LIKED THIS SUGGESTION. (COMMENT: THE EFFECT OF THE ITALIAN PROPOSAL, AND THE DISCUSSION WHICH FOLLOWED, WAS TO EMPHASIZE THE ISOLATION OF BELGIUM ON THE SUBJECT OF RELATIONSHIP OF MANPOWER LIMITATIONS TO EQUIPMENT.)

15. FRG REP ASKED IF THE US COULD EXPLAIN WHY IT WAS UNABLE TO ACDEPT AT THE LAST MEETING THE UK PROPOSAL, RE PARA 6 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, TO REPLACE " WITHDRAWN BY THE US" BY " US NUCLEAR ELEMENTS WHICH ARE LIMITED AS DESCRIBED ABOVE". HE SAID THE UK SUGGESTION SEEMED REASONABLE TO FRG. US REP REPLIED THAT HE HOPED TO BE ABLE TO COMMENT ON THIS POINT AT THE NEXT MEETING. (SEE PARA 6, REF D, AND PARA 10 REF C FOR BACKGROUND OF THIS ISSUE. WE WOULD APPRECIATE GUIDANCE IN TIME FOR NEXT SPC MEETING.)

16. ACTION REQUESTED: IF POSSIBLE IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING, MONDAY OCTOBER 6:

A. INITIAL REACTION TO UK PROPOSAL ON APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF THE COMMON CEILING. INADDITION TO THE DIFFICULTIES THE US ALREADY HAD WITH THE FRG LANGUAGE IN THE DRAFT POSITION PAPER, WE DO NOT SEE HOW THE ALLIES COULD USE THE US LANGUAGE IN THE DRAFT GUDANCE ON THIS POINT WITH THE EAST IN INITIAL PRESENTATIONS, AND THEN LATER IN THE PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS INFORM THEM THAT WE WERE LEVYING TWO MAJOR NEW REQUIREMENTS AS A CONDITION FOR PHASE I AGREEMENT.

B. THE GUIDANCE REQUESTED IN PARA 11, REF C.
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05387 03 OF 03 031451Z

C. WASHINGTON REACTION TO PERSONAL SUGGESTION OF FRG AND UK REPS IN PARA 14 ABOVE. STREATOR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 03 OCT 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO05387
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: UMISSION NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197510101/abbrzmib.tel
Line Count: 355
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 5118 DTG 191415Z SEP 75 B. USNATO 4857 DTG 081500 Z SEP 75 C. USNATO 5306 DTG 301500Z SEP 75 D.
USNATO 5251 DTG 251759Z SEP 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03 APR 2003 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING OCTOBER 2
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006